



**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/672,639	09/28/2000	Gary Dan Dotson	00AB154	7884

7590 07/11/2003

Allen-Bradley Company Inc  
Attention: John J Horn  
Patent Dept/704P Floor 8 T-29  
1201 South Second Street  
Milwaukee, WI 53204

EXAMINER

WANG, JIN CHENG

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2672

DATE MAILED: 07/11/2003

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/672,639

Applicant(s)

DOTSON ET AL.

Examiner

Jin-Cheng Wang

Art Unit

2672

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 09 June 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]**

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.  
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:  
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);  
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.  
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.  
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

1) Applicant argues in essence that "Tjandrasuwita does not disclose a grayscale generator programmable to generate grayscale formatted data according to a selected display mode as recited by claims 1 and 22. In response, the examiner asserts that Tjandrasuwita teaches a grayscale generator programmable to generate grayscale formatted data according to a selected display mode as recited by claim and similar claims. Specifically, Tjandrasuwita teaches a raster engine (flat panel interface 113 of figure 2) for interfacing a frame buffer in a computer system (figure 1) to one of a plurality of disparate display types (column 4, lines 52-61), comprising:

(a) At least one control register programmable via the computer system to select a display mode (column 5, lines 58-65), e.g., the display mode can be selected for one of a plurality of disparate display types and formats (figure 2, and column 6, lines 1-20);

(b) A grayscale generator (e.g., figures 2-4 and column 5, lines 11-67, column 6, lines 1-67, column 8, lines 1-18) operative to obtain pixel data from the frame buffer (column 4, lines 62-67) and programmable via the computer system to generate gray scale formatted data (to generate gray scale shading using time or frame modulation technique and the different gray shades can be generated by turning on and off the pixel) according to the selected display mode (column 6, lines 48-60); and

(c) A logic device (multiplexor 208) having a parallel output (e.g., to a LCD display monitor), the logic device (SEL2 which may originate from a control register that is programmed by the CPU as indicated by the user) being adapted to select appropriate pixel data from the grayscale generator (figures 2-4) according to the selected display mode (see the abstract of the reference), and to provide the selected pixel data at the parallel output according to the selected display mode (figure 2, and column 6, lines 2-20).

Therefore, Tjandrasuwita fulfills claim 1 as currently drafted.

2) Applicant argues that "While Tjandrasuwita does disclose that data can be formatted for either TFT mode or STN mode, the reference does not disclose, teach or suggest either expressly or inherently employing grayscale logic 301 with respect to both TFT and STN modes. The mere fact that such functionality may be possible is not sufficient to establish the anticipation of independent claims 1, 15, and 22 under 102". In response, the examiner asserts this argument is NOT found persuasive because in contrary to the applicant's arguments relating to a selected display mode, the claim limitation as set forth in the amended claim 1 and similar claims however recites selecting a display mode for ONE of a plurality of disparate display types and formats. Therefore, as Tjandrasuwita teaches data can be formatted for either TFT mode or STN mode, the reference therefore meets the claimed limitation of selecting a display mode for ONE of a plurality of disparate display types and formats in the amended claim 1 and similar claims.

3) Applicant argues in essence that "Additionally, a person of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated, without consulting the applicants' specification, to modify Tjandrasuwita to produce the subject invention as claimed at least in part because Tjandrasuwita fails to teach or suggest the desirability of producing a single raster engine capable of providing grayscale data to one of a plurality of disparate display types, formats, or modes (e.g., CRT, LCD, TFT, STN)." ". In response, the examiner asserts this argument is NOT found persuasive because in contrary to the applicant's arguments, the claim limitation as set forth in the amended claim 1 and similar claims however recites selecting a display mode for ONE of a plurality of disparate display types and formats. Therefore, as Tjandrasuwita teaches data can be formatted for either TFT mode or STN mode, the reference therefore meets the claimed limitation of selecting a display mode for ONE of a plurality of disparate display types and formats in the amended claim 1 and similar claims.

4) Applicant argues in essence that "Tjandrasuwita does not disclose a raster engine providing selected pixel data at a parallel output according to a selected display mode, as recited by independent claims 1 and 22. In response, the examiner asserts that the argument is not found in the amended claim 1. Furthermore, the examiner asserts that this argument is NOT found persuasive because in contrary to the applicant's arguments relating to a selected display mode, the claim limitation as set forth in the amended claim 1 and similar claims however recites selecting a display mode for ONE of a plurality of disparate display types and formats. Since Tjandrasuwita teaches data can be formatted for either TFT mode or STN mode, the reference therefore meets the claimed limitation of selecting a display mode for ONE of a plurality of disparate display types and formats in the amended claim 1 and similar claims.

5) Applicant argues in essence that "Finally, as per claim 15, Tjandrasuwita fails to disclose teach or suggest a grayscale lookup table control register programmable by a computer system". In response, the examiner asserts that Tjandrasuwita teaches the claimed limitation of a grayscale lookup table control register programmable by a computer system (See column 8, lines 3-67 of Tjandrasuwita).